

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER CHARLES WOOD,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:06-CV-631
(Criminal Case No. 1:04-CR-205)

HON. GORDON J. QUIST

OPINION

This Court has before it Christopher Charles Wood's ("Petitioner") Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody. Promptly after the filing of a § 2255 motion, the court must undertake a preliminary review of the motion to determine whether it plainly appears from the motion, the attached exhibits and the record of prior proceedings that Petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court. Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2255 Cases. If so, the court shall make an order for its summary dismissal. *Id.* A dismissal under Rule 4 includes those petitions which raise legally frivolous claims, as well as those containing factual allegations that are palpably incredible or false. *See Carson v. Burke*, 178 F.3d 434, 436-37 (6th Cir. 1999) (applying Rule 4 to petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254). After undertaking the review required by Rule 4, the Court concludes that Petitioner is not entitled to relief.

I. Procedural History

On November 18, 2004, Petitioner pled guilty to bank robbery in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a). On February 22, 2005, this Court sentenced Petitioner to 156 months incarceration, and Judgment was entered on February 23, 2005. Petitioner appealed his sentence and conviction to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and that court affirmed this Court's Judgment on September 16, 2005. On September 1, 2006, Petitioner timely filed this motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

II. Petitioner's Claims are Procedurally Defaulted

The essence of this petition is that (1) the district court erred when it ordered Petitioner to submit to urine testing as a condition of supervised release without placing any limit on the number of drug tests; and (2) the district court erred in imposing a period of supervised release, which was not authorized by the statute.

Both of these claims fail because Petitioner did not raise them on direct review. As the Supreme Court has said, § 2255 petitions are not substitutes for direct appeals. *See Reed v. Farley*, 512 U.S. 339, 354, 114 S. Ct. 2291, 2300 (1994); *United States v. Frady*, 456 U.S. 152, 165, 102 S. Ct. 1584, 1593 (1982); *Hunter v. United States*, 160 F.3d 1109, 1114 (6th Cir. 1998). The Supreme Court has imposed strict limitations upon the circumstances under which a guilty plea may be attacked on collateral review. *See Bousley v. United States*, 523 U.S. 614, 620, 118 S. Ct. 1604, 1610 (1998); *Mabry v. Johnson*, 467 U.S. 504, 508, 104 S. Ct. 2543, 2546-47 (1984). Because Petitioner failed to challenge his claims on direct appeal, his claims are procedurally defaulted. *See Bousley*, 523 U.S. at 622, 118 S. Ct. at 1611; *Hampton v. United States*, 191 F.3d 695, 698 (6th Cir. 1999). As such, Petitioner is barred from raising his claims in a § 2255 motion unless he can demonstrate that “cause” and “actual prejudice” existed to excuse his failure to raise the issues on direct appeal, or that a constitutional error at the plea proceedings “has probably resulted in the conviction of one who is actually innocent.” *Bousley*, 523 U.S. at 622, 118 S. Ct. at 1611 (citing *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 488, 106 S. Ct. 2639, 2645 (1986)); *Hampton*, 191 F.3d at 698-99. To show cause, Petitioner must point to “some objective factor external to the defense” that prohibited him from raising his claims on direct appeal. *Murray*, 477 U.S. at 488, 106 S. Ct. at 2645. To show prejudice, he must demonstrate an error that worked to his actual and substantial disadvantage. *Frady*, 456 U.S. at 170, 102 S. Ct. at 1595-96.

Petitioner fails to allege or show that he is actually innocent of the offense for which he pled guilty. Likewise, he fails to allege or show that some external impediment prevented him from pursuing his claims on direct appeal. Moreover, he cannot show prejudice because the issues are without merit. In order to prevail on his § 2255 motion, Petitioner “must demonstrate the existence of an error of constitutional magnitude which had a substantial and injurious effect or influence on the guilty plea. . . .” *Schledwitz v. United States*, 169 F.3d 1003, 1011 (6th Cir. 1999) (citing *Brecht v. Abramson*, 507 U.S. 619, 637, 113 S. Ct. 1710, 1721 (1993)); *see also Wright v. United States*, 182 F.3d 458, 463 (6th Cir. 1999). Petitioner has not met this burden. Therefore, his claims must be dismissed.

III. No Certificate of Appealability

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the Court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s action under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2255 Cases is a determination that the § 2255 motion, on its face, lacks sufficient merit to warrant service. It would be highly unlikely for this Court to grant a certificate, thus indicating to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that an issue merits review, when the Court has already determined that the action is so lacking in merit that service is not warranted. *See Love v. Butler*, 952 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1991) (it is “somewhat anomalous” for the court to summarily dismiss under Rule 4 and grant a certificate); *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490 (9th Cir. 1990) (requiring reversal where court summarily dismissed under Rule 4 but granted certificate); *Dory v. Commissioner of Correction of the State of New York*, 865 F.2d 44, 46 (2d Cir. 1989) (it was “intrinsically contradictory” to grant a certificate when habeas action does not warrant service under Rule 4); *Williams v. Kullman*, 722

F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983) (issuing certificate would be inconsistent with a summary dismissal).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. 2001). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* at 467. Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S. Ct. 1595 (2000). *Murphy*, 263 F.3d at 467. Consequently, this Court has examined each of Petitioner’s claims under the *Slack* standard.

Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, 120 S. Ct. at 1604, to warrant a grant of the certificate, “[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” The Court finds that reasonable jurists could not find that this Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s claims was debatable or wrong. Therefore, the Court will deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

Conclusion

For these reasons, Petitioner’s § 2255 Motion (docket no. 1) will be DISMISSED pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2255 Cases. In addition, a certificate of appealability will be DENIED as to each issue raised by Petitioner because he has failed to make a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.”

A separate order will issue.

Dated: October 26, 2006

/s/ Gordon J. Quist
GORDON J. QUIST
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE